

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/780,901	BOEHM, CHARLENE A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ardin Marschel	1631	

All Participants:

(1) Ardin Marschel(Exr.).

(2) Charlene Boehm (Applicant).

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8 March 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

generally rejection(s) in the action, mailed 9/9/04

Claims discussed:

all pending in gneral

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Ardin Marschel 3/8/05
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Exr. Marschel indicated issues of improper amending and needing a Declaration for evidence in arguments, filed 1/7/05. Exr. Marschel indicated that a reopening of prosecution office action is being prepared which will withdraw the finality of the action, mailed 9/9/04..

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

The applicant thanks Examiner Marschel and Supervisor Woodward for their time given in the telephonic interview conducted with the applicant on December 17, 2004. Following is a summary of the interview.

The applicant briefly explained the reasons for the revocation of attorney action taken in November 2004, and advised the examiner that applicant was unable to review and approve the response sent to the examiner on June 9, 2004 by counsel retained at that time. This problem was caused by counsel's failure to submit the material to the applicant with enough lead time to approve it. Applicant received counsel's version of the response four hours before it was sent to this office. The applicant was working away from her office, and had no opportunity to read or review that document. The applicant feels counsel's negligence on this matter resulted in a potentially serious misunderstanding by the examiner on one major point of discussion, that regarding resonance. (This is further addressed in the applicant's full response included with this paper. Confirmation of the applicant's circumstances is also submitted with this paper as an attached document).

In the phone interview, applicant further advised the examiner of intense research and developments in the closely related fields of bioelectromagnetics and biophysics, including but not limited to: application of electric fields for medical diagnostics and devices; bioeffects of pulsed microwaves, millimeter waves and nonthermal plasmas; biological decontamination by pulsed electric fields; plasma-based sterilization; and biomedical application of plasmas. The applicant stated that she has experienced numerous inquiries from parties wanting to use her method for commercial applications and/or research, and asked that her application might come under timely consideration by the office in view of the long period (nearly four years) since submission of the nonprovisional application.

INT-
AN
SUM DK
3-8-05